

**REMARKS**

Claim Status

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1, 4, 6-8, 10 and 27 have been amended, claims 17-26 and 28 have been canceled, and claims 29-31 have been added; claims 1-14, 16, 27, 29-31 remaining pending.

Claim Objection

Claim 4 is objected to as having a grammatical error. More specifically, it is alleged that claim 4 recites “at least one a category” on line 5. A closer review of claim 4, as submitted in the previous Amendment, shows that the word “a” has already been deleted with a strikethrough, although admittedly the strikethrough was somewhat difficult to discern. Therefore, no correction is required and Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the foregoing objection.

Claim 27

Claim 27 was previously added. Claim 27 depends from claim 10. While Applicant understands why claim 28 (which depends from claim 17) was withdrawn from consideration due to the restriction requirement made with respect to claims 17-26, it is unclear to Applicant why claim 27 which does not depend from any of claims 17-26 but rather depends from claim 10 was also withdrawn. Applicant respectfully requests an explanation with respect to claim 27.

New Claims

Claims 29-31 have been added. It is believed that these claims are fully supported by the specification and do not introduce any new matter.

35 USC 112 Rejections

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. More specifically, it is alleged that claim 6 recites “sub-dimensions” for which there is no disclosure in the specification. Claim 6 has been amended and is now believed to be in compliance. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the foregoing rejection.

Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. More specifically, it is alleged that claims 1 and 8 include the sentence segment “only one or more portions” which renders the claim indefinite. Claims 1 and 8 have been amended and are now

believed to be in compliance. Consequently, claims 2-7 and 9-16 are also now in compliance. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the foregoing rejection.

**35 USC 103 Rejection**

Claims 1-4, 6-10, 11-13 and 16 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zellweger (US Pat. No. 6,379,222) in view of Wical (US Pat. No. 6,460,034). For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicant respectfully traverses the foregoing rejection and respectfully submits that these claims are patentable over the cited art.

With respect to claim 1, contrary to the conclusions stated in the Office Action, Zellweger does not disclose at least one or more of the features as recited in this claim. For example, Zellweger does not allow a user to concurrently select values for the dimensions. FIG 10, as cited in the Office Action, does not allow concurrent selection by a user. FIG 10 clearly shows that the dimensions (departments, services, employees etc.), each represented by its own selection window, cannot be selected by the user concurrently. The selection windows are lined up sequentially one after another. For example, as shown in FIG 10, the “departments” selection window is behind the “services” selection window. It is commonly known that, in a Windows operating environment such as the one shown in FIG 10, one window hiding behind another window cannot be active. As a result, when the “services” selection window is active, the “departments” selection window must not be active. Therefore, concurrent selection cannot be made with the “services” and “departments” selection windows. Also, Zellweger does not identify web pages with information that meets all the respective values for the chosen dimensions. The cited excerpt, Col. 3, lines 48-52, does not show otherwise. As stated in the cited excerpt, “[e]ach time an end-user selects a topic entry in list menu 22, content menu 21 either generates a successor list menu 22 that refines the selected topic or 21 displays the information object linked to the selected list menu entry.” First, there is no indication that the Zellweger system identifies any web pages based on the chosen dimensions. The Zellweger system merely displays an information object that is linked to a selected entry. Second, as the cited excerpt shows, the Zellweger system does not handle multiple concurrently chosen dimensions – for example, “an end-user selects a topic” and “the information object linked to the selected list menu entry” both indicate that only a single topic is chosen each time. Since Zellweger does not disclose or suggest at least one or more of the features as recited in claim 1, combining Zellweger with Wical would not have resulted in the present invention.

Furthermore, Wical does not disclose or suggest forwarding only portions of a web page that meet the values for the chosen dimensions to a user computer. As best understood by Applicant, the cited excerpt, Col. 23, lines 1-15, only provides an explanation of FIG. 9C, which explains how query terms are mapped to various categories. The various groups refer to different themes and not portions of a document. For example, Col. 23, lines 7-11, state that “for group IA, the themes: beer, knockwurst, Oktoberfest, stein and sauerkraut, all appear under the categories “customs and practices”, “drinking and dining”, and “Germany”. The groups referred to in the cited excerpt are not the same as portions of a web page that meet the values for the chosen dimensions. Hence, combining Wical and Zellweger would not have resulted in the present invention as recited in claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentable over the cited art.

Claims 2-6 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 1, and hence at least derive their respective patentability therefrom. Notwithstanding the foregoing, at least some if not all of these claims on their own are also patentable over the cited art. For example, with respect to claim 3, Wical does not disclose or suggest displaying a list of identified web pages. The cited excerpt, Col. 5, lines 3-10, merely state that “[i]n contrast, the concept knowledge base queries do not identify specific documents in response to a query, but identify the potential existence of a document by displaying associated categories and themes. In essence, for the concept knowledge base query, the user learns that if documents do exist for the search query, the documents may be located under or associated with these categories and terminology for a particular context of the search query. The user may use the identified categories and terminology to locate the information in a different system.” Nowhere in this cited excerpt is it mentioned that a list of identified web pages is displayed. To the contrary, the cited excerpt states that the concept knowledge base queries do not identify specific documents. Hence, claim 3 by itself is also patentable over the cited art.

Also, with respect to claim 4, Wical does not disclose or suggest at least one or more of the features as recited in this claim. As mentioned above, the cited excerpt, Col. 23, lines 1-7, merely provides an explanation of FIG. 9C, which explains how query terms are mapped to various categories. The various groups refer to different themes and not portions of a document. Based on this cited excerpt, Wical clearly does not disclose or suggest creating a document having a number of portions. Also, Wical does not disclose or suggest associating each portion of the document with a value for at least one dimension. The cited excerpt, Col. 11, lines 14-35, merely provides an explanation of FIG. 4, which merely illustrates a classification hierarchy. Contrary to the

Examiner's conclusion, the Wical system is a search and retrieval system and a user query does not assign dimensions to a document. Wical also merely discloses that a dimension might have different values; however, it does not disclose or suggest different portions of a document having different values for the same dimension. Hence, claim 4 by itself is also patentable over the cited art.

With respect to claims 7 and 8, the same arguments and rationale as set forth above in connection with claim 1 apply with equal force. Hence, claims 7 and 8 are also patentable over the cited art.

With respect to claim 9, this claim depends from claim 8 and thus at least derives its patentability therefrom. Therefore, claim 9 is also patentable over the cited art.

With respect to claim 10, the same arguments and rationale as set forth above in connection with claims 1 and 4 apply with equal force. Hence, claim 10 is also patentable over the cited art.

With respect to claims 11-14 and 16, these claims depend from claim 10 and thus at least derive their respective patentability therefrom. Therefore, claims 11-14 and 16 are also patentable over the cited art.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zellweger in view of Wical as applied to claim 4 and further in view of Mills (US Pat. No. 6,466,940). As mentioned above, claim 4 is also patentable over the cited art. Since claim 5 depends from claim 4, this claim at least derives its patentability therefrom. Hence, claim 5 is also patentable over the cited art. Notwithstanding the foregoing, claim 5 by itself is also patentable over the cited art. Zellweger does not disclose or suggest associating a user with dimensions. The cited excerpts, Col. 5, lines 41-48 and Col. 5, lines 66 – Col. 6, line 7, merely show that the Zellweger system allows a user to bind a URL to a data structure. That is not the same as associating a user with dimensions. Under the Zellweger system, the user is not associated with any dimensions. Furthermore, Mills does not disclose or suggest using the user's associated dimension values as default values for a created document. The cited excerpts, Col. 9, lines 40-50 and Col. 9, lines 60 – Col. 10, line 2, clearly do not show otherwise. Hence, combining Mills with Zellweger and Wical would not have resulted in the present invention as recited in claim 5.

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zellweger in view of Wical as applied to claim 14 and further in view of Merriman et al. (US Pat. No. 5,948,061). Claim

14 depends from claim 10 and thus at least derives its patentability therefrom. Therefore, claim 14 is also patentable over the cited art.


Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicant believes all claims now pending in this application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at the telephone number provided below.

No fee is required for this amendment, if it is determined that a fee is due in connection with this paper, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any fees associated with this communication or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 502203, including any filing fees under 37 CFR 1.16 for presentation of extra claims and any patent application processing fees under 37 CFR 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP

  
Horace H. Ng  
Registration No. 39,315

18191 Von Karman Ave., Suite 400  
Irvine, CA 92612-7107  
Telephone: 949.851.0633  
Facsimile: 949.851.9348  
HN:al

**Date: December 10, 2004**

MPK 82287-1.072130.0012